



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/694,433	10/23/2000	Andrew Read	TRANS59	3072
7590	04/19/2004		EXAMINER	
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP TWO NORTH MARKET STREET THIRD FLOOR SAN JOSE, CA 95113			CAO, CHUN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2115	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/694,433	READ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Chun Cao	2115	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11,13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8,9,11</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## FINAL REJECTION

1. Claims 1-13 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those applicable section of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicant fails to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, i.e. failing to provide and enabling disclosure. Applicant fails to disclose the detail of "said value of the core voltage is not sufficient to maintain processing activity in said processor". The examiner submits that it would require undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention for the reason set forth hereinabove. Applicant are reminded that no new matter is allowed in amendment to the specification under 35 U.S.C. 132 and 37 CFR 1.118(a).

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected because they incorporate the deficiencies of claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orton et al. (Orton), US patent no. 6,118,306, in view of Horden et al. (Horden), US patent no. 5,812,860.

Orton is a prior art reference cited by applicant in IDS paper no. 6.

Horden is a prior art reference cited by applicant in IDS paper no. 9.

As per claim 1, Orton teaches that a method for reducing power utilized by a processor comprising the steps of:

determining that a processor is transitioning from a computing mode to a mode in which system clock to the processor is disabled [col. 2, lines 44-60]; and  
reducing core voltage to the processor to a value sufficient to maintain state during the mode of which system clock is disable [col. 3, lines 10-20].

Orton does not explicitly teach that the value of the core voltage is not sufficient to maintain processing activity in said processor.

Horden teaches that a voltage regulator provides an idle voltage to the processor according to the clock frequency [col. 3, lines 28-34, 40-60; col. 6, lines 27-34]. Inherently, Horden teaches that the value of the core voltage is not sufficient to maintain processing activity in said processor [the processor is idle].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention to combine the teachings of Orton and Horden because they are both directed to the problem of reducing the power consumption of a processor core, and the specify teachings of Horden stated above would have allowed for improving power consumption by further reducing the core voltage to a minimum supported voltage.

As per claim 2, Orton teaches of determining the processor is transitioning from a computing mode to a mode in which system clock to the processor is disabled comprises monitoring a stop clock signal [col. 2, lines 44-60; col. 5, lines 4-11; col. 7, lines 38-43].

As per claim 3, Orton teaches of reducing an output voltage providing by a voltage regulator furnishing core voltage to the processor and providing a feedback signal to the voltage regulator to reduce its output voltage below a specified output voltage [col. 2, lines 24-27; col. 3, lines 10-19; col. 7, lines 14-19, 44-58].

6. Claims 4-11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (a) or 102(e) as being anticipated by Orton et al. (Orton), US patent no. 6,118,306.

7. As per claim 4, Orton teaches that a method for reducing power utilized by a processor comprising the steps of:

determining that a processor is transitioning from a computing mode to a mode in which system clock to the processor is disabled [col. 2, lines 44-60];  
reducing core voltage to the processor to a value sufficient to maintain state during the mode of which system clock is disable; [col. 3, lines 10-20] by:

furnishing an input to reduce an output voltage provided by a voltage regulator furnishing core voltage to the processor and providing a feedback signal to the voltage regulator to reduce its output voltage below a specified output voltage [col. 2, lines 24-27; col. 3, lines 10-19; col. 7, lines 14-19, 44-58].

8. As per claim 5, Orton teaches a method for reducing power utilized by a processor comprising the steps of:

determining that a processor is transitioning from a computing mode to a mode in which system clock to the processor is disabled [col. 2, lines 44-60];

reducing core voltage to the processor to a value sufficient to maintain state during the mode of which system clock is disable; [col. 3, lines 10-20]; and

transferring operation of a voltage regulator furnishing core voltage in a mode in which power is dissipated during reductions in core voltage to a mode in which power is saved during a voltage transition when it is determined at a processor is transitioning from a computing mode to a mode in which system clock to the processor is disabled [col. 2, lines 11-27, 44-65].

As per claim 6, Orton teaches of returning the voltage regulator to its original mode of operation [col. 3, lines 10-14; col. 7, lines 51-58; col. 8, lines 54-65].

9. As per claim 7, Orton discloses a circuit [fig. 5] for providing a regulated voltage to a processor comprising:

a voltage regulator [52, fig. 1, fig. 5] having: an output terminal [col. 7, lines 50-51; "the output from the voltage regulator 52", inherently, there is an output terminal in the voltage regulator 52] providing a selectable voltage [col. 3, lines 10-12; col. 7, lines

28-31, 46-47, "...adjust the voltage level supplied by the voltage regulator 52 up or down" and "to indicate that the voltage level from the voltage regulator 52 is changing"];

input terminal [fig. 5; col. 7, lines 52-55; "the voltage interface provided the control logic portion 400 allows the voltage regulator 52 to change settings", inherently, there is an input terminal in the voltage regulator 52] for receiving signals indicating the selectable voltage level;

means for providing signal at the input terminal of the voltage regulator for selecting a voltage for operating the processor in a computing mode and a voltage of a level less than that for operating the processor in computing mode [col. 7, lines 50-65], wherein the level less than that for operating the processor in a computing mode is sufficient to maintain state of the processor [col. 2, lines 44-65; col. 3, lines 10-20].

As per claim 8, Orton discloses that the voltage regulator comprises means for accepting binary signals [LO/HI signals] indicating different voltage level [fig. 5; col. 7, lines 20-37, 63-65; "A signal **VR\_LO/HI#**...adjust the voltage level supplied by the voltage regulator 52 up or down"].

As per claim 9, Orton discloses that the voltage regulator comprises:

Selection circuitry, means for furnishing a plurality of signals at the input to the selection circuitry and means for controlling the selection by the selection circuitry [fig. 3A] [col. 5, lines 38-55].

As per claim 10, Orton discloses a multiplexor [col. 5, lines 44-45; fig. 3A] and means for controlling the selection by the selection circuitry including a control terminal

for receiving signals indicating a system clock to the processor is being terminated [col. 5, lines 38-65].

10. As per claim 11, Orton discloses a circuit [fig. 5] for providing a regulated voltage to a processor comprising:

a voltage regulator [52, fig. 1, fig. 5] having: an output terminal [col. 7, lines 50-51; “the output from the voltage regulator 52”, inherently, there is an output terminal in the voltage regulator 52] providing a selectable voltage [col. 3, lines 10-12; col. 7, lines 28-31, 46-47, “...adjust the voltage level supplied by the voltage regulator 52 up or down” and “to indicate that the voltage level from the voltage regulator 52 is changing”];

input terminal [fig. 5; col. 7, lines 52-55; “the voltage interface provided the control logic portion 400 allows the voltage regulator 52 to change settings”, inherently, there is an input terminal in the voltage regulator 52] for receiving signals indicating the selectable voltage level;

means for providing signal at the input terminal of the voltage regulator for selecting a voltage for operating the processor in a computing mode and a voltage of a level less than that for operating the processor in computing mode [col. 7, lines 50-65],

means for reducing the selectable voltage below a level provided by the voltage regulator [col. 7, lines 50-65].

11. As per claim 13, Orton discloses a circuit [fig. 5] for providing a regulated voltage to a processor comprising:

a voltage regulator [52, fig. 1, fig. 5] having: an output terminal [col. 7, lines 50-51; “the output from the voltage regulator 52”, inherently, there is an output terminal in

the voltage regulator 52] providing a selectable voltage [col. 3, lines 10-12; col. 7, lines 28-31, 46-47, "...adjust the voltage level supplied by the voltage regulator 52 up or down" and "to indicate that the voltage level from the voltage regulator 52 is changing"];

input terminal [fig. 5; col. 7, lines 52-55; "the voltage interface provided the control logic portion 400 allows the voltage regulator 52 to change settings", inherently, there is an input terminal in the voltage regulator 52] for receiving signals indicating the selectable voltage level;

means for providing signal at the input terminal of the voltage regulator for selecting a voltage for operating the processor in a computing mode and a voltage of a level less than that for operating the processor in computing mode [col. 7, lines 50-65],

circuitry for conserving charge [battery 60] stored by the voltage regulator when the selectable voltage decreases; and means for enabling the circuitry for conserving charge stored by the voltage regulator when the selectable voltage decreases [col. 7, lines 28-58].

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

12. Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. Applicant's argument with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chun Cao at (703) 308-6106. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am - 4:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Thomas Lee can be reached at (703) 305-9717. The fax number for this Art Unit is following: Official (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2115

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chun Cao

Apr. 12, 2004



THOMAS LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100